



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,377	04/30/2006	Nils Alberto Heinke	ADAM0003-100	2309
53296 7590 09/11/2008 COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C. 1900 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19380				
EXAMINER BERGIN, JAMES S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3641				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/11/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/574,377

**Applicant(s)**

HEINKE ET AL.

**Examiner**

JAMES S. BERGIN

**Art Unit**

3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/3/2006

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species A, the embodiment depicted in Fig. 1.

Species B, the embodiment depicted in Fig. 2.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims appear to be generic to both species A and species B. Species B shows blasting material sitting and being supported on the bottom of the drill hole. The position of the blasting material in species B cannot be reasonably and clearly interpreted as being "*at a relatively low level toward said bottom*" when it is actually sitting and being supported on the bottom.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined** even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: typographical errors "said" on line 5; "blsting" on line 6. A review of the claims should now be performed by the applicant for any remaining typographical errors. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the method and apparatus including plugs supporting the plunger material and the blasting material, does not reasonably provide enablement for an embodiment that does not comprise plugs supporting the plunger material and the blasting material. The specification does not enable any

person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Any claimed embodiment that does not comprise plugs supporting the plunger material and the blasting material is beyond the scope of the disclosed invention. It is noted that both of the illustrated embodiments as seen in Figs. 1 & 2, clearly show plugs supporting the plunger material and the blasting material.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1 and claim 13, the limitations, "*at a relatively low level towards said bottom*" and "*at a relatively high level remote from said bottom*" are indefinite because one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the limitations, "*relatively low*" and "*relatively high*" and therefore would one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claims 9 and 21 are indefinite because claims 1 and 13 have already claimed that the blasting material is "*at a relatively low level toward said bottom*" which limitation does not reasonably cover embodiments that comprise the blasting material actually being supported on the bottom.

7. Claims 13-18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap

between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: plugs supporting the plunger material and the blasting material.

8. Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the step of supporting the plunger material and the blasting material on plugs.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rajkovich (US 5,497,829). (The following rejection is offered in as much as the claims can be interpreted in the light of the 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections as discussed above).

Rajkovich discloses a method of charging and blasting a drill hole comprising providing the drill hole with a lower blasting charge at the bottom of the drill hole (Fig. 3); providing in the drill hole a lower layer of plunger material above the lower blasting charge (interpreted as the first stemming layer above the lower layer of lowermost airspace in Rajkovich's Fig. 3); providing in the drill hole a higher layer of plunger material (interpreted as the intermediate stemming layer between the lowermost stemming layer and the uppermost stemming layer in Rajkovich's Fig. 3); and providing in the drill hole a higher layer of blasting charge (interpreted as the uppermost layer of

powder in Rajkovich's Fig. 3). Initiators for blasting the charges and an initiator controller are inherent to Rajkovich. Upon initiation of the charges, Rajkovich's lower layer of plunger material (as identified above) and Rajkovich's higher layer of plunger material (as identified above) would inherently impinge upon each other to produce pressure or shock waves to effect destruction of the rock in the surrounding material.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2-12 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rajkovich (US 5,497,829) in view of official notice. (The following rejection is offered in as much as the claims can be interpreted in the light of the 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections as discussed above).

Rajkovich discloses a method of charging and blasting a drill hole as described above. Rajkovich either implicitly or explicitly discloses the limitations of claims 2-12 and 14-22. In the alternative, the examiner takes official notice that the method steps, and charged drill hole of claims 2-12 and 14-22, claim only that which was well known in the art and well within the skill level of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and therefore would have been obvious to combine same with the method and charged drill hole of Rajkovich.



**Conclusion**

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the attached PTO FORM 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES S. BERGIN whose telephone number is (571)272-6872. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Wednesday and Friday, 8.30 - 5.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 571-272-6873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James S. Bergin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3641

Application/Control Number: 10/574,377  
Art Unit: 3641

Page 9